

Why are the channels silent now?

[The plight of Dr Dharmesh's wife, raped with her husband's consent, gets little or no coverage in the biased corporate media. Why?]

[By Maulana Asrarul Haq Qasmi, Rashtriya Sahara, Hyderabad, 03.11.2009, 14.11.1430]

In this world anything is possible, even the unimaginable. Hence, we have a queer but heart-rending news from Rajkot. An impotent and emasculate husband got the modesty of his wife desecrated [dishonoured] by his father. Though the mother-, brothers- and sisters-in-law of the wife abetted this act, yet the main role is of the shameless husband who was impotent and still desired a child. The Rajkot woman registered a report two weeks back in the police station of her parental locality, Morbi ta'alluka, two months after the incident. Had this act of moral depravity taken place in the West, it would not have been so amazing and astonishing, as such very animality [animal-like act] is termed modernity there. But the occurrence of this incident in an educated family of Rajkot demonstrates that the ill-effects of Western and American culture, in their ugly and hideous form, are showing up in India as well.

Visit
www.scribd.com/musarhad
for more articles on Islaam.

The victimized woman also accused her father-in-law Vimal Gopani and others of beating her severely before committing this act. In fact an attempt was made to kill her when she resisted. According to the case registered with the police, the woman was married with Dharmesh of Rajkot seven years ago, who is a doctor by profession. When the couple did not have an offspring in the initial two years, she was taken to a female sex-specialist who declared that the woman was barren and she could never have a child. But the woman was not satisfied with that doctor's diagnosis and she consulted another doctor. After medical examination, the second female sex-specialist said that there was no fault in her and that she had the ability to produce a child. When she reported this diagnosis to her in-laws, they accepted, after some initial dispute, that the problem was with their son only and that his medical treatment would be taken up. But instead of treating him, one day her father-in-law, Vimal Gopani made her consume a drink containing sleeping pill. The woman became semi-conscious and then the father-in-law raped the wife of his son, Dr Dharmesh. During this crime, the woman put up a little resistance but she was assaulted. When the ravished [molested] wife complained about this to her impotent husband, he allegedly admitted that all this happened according to a pre-planned scheme so that they could have a child.

There is no denying the gruesomeness and ghastliness of the aforementioned [above-mentioned] incident, yet the question is: did you hear or see anything about the incident on any TV channel? Did you find a court being set up on any channel? Did you see any channel finding out the public opinion on the issue all over the country? Did you see the molested woman and her rapist father-in-law facing and questioning each other in any news channel studio? Did you get to watch pandits and experts on Hindu personal law expressing their opinions on the incident? Did you find Hinduism maligned on the pretext of the woman's suffering and the man's cruelty? Leave alone the TV channels, even the newspapers did not report it barring one exception. However, the news is available on the internet if you search for it. Why is it so? The reason is that this Rajkot woman is not Imrana of Muzaffarnagar, where they found an excuse for defaming Islam.

The readers must be remembering the incident of a certain village of Muzaffarnagar in western Uttar Pradesh in which a married woman and mother of several children, Imrana, had charged her father-in-law with forcefully entering her house in the darkness of night and raping her. The woman's husband pulled rickshaw for livelihood. When a fatwa on this incident was obtained, it was found that the woman had become haraam [prohibited from continuing the marriage] for the husband. The woman announced that she would accept the verdict of the Islamic sharia and also appealed to the media not to publish this story any further. But for the anti-Islam media, the story had not ended here, it had just begun. No sooner did a local Hindi newspaper publish the news than did the TV channels' journalists make a beeline to this small, nondescript village of Muzaffarnagar.

Soon the illiterate family was made to come to Delhi-based studios of different TV channels. There, on one side would be the allegedly raped woman and her husband, and on the other side her [allegedly] rapist father- and mother-in-law. And then there would be an exchange of dialogues between them, from time to time. Most of the time, the opinions of the experts would be telecast, while at other times, there would be live reports from the numerous teams of cameramen wandering in the streets of different cities of India to get public opinion on the issue. And thus a public court would be staged on the TV screens. The two parties would be sitting like statues watching their own show [spectacle], not knowing if they could even raise a voice of protest against this exploitation [and emotional torture by the TV channels]. They would be sitting in a spacious hall equipped with different sorts of machines, listening to an assorted collection of sound bytes wherein people would be speaking things they could hardly understand. They would be worrying if, in such a setting, speaking would be against the etiquettes. What if the BIG PEOPLE (Islam-hating anchors, journalists and editors) get angry? And in this way Islam and Islamic sharia (law) would be mocked at and joked about throughout the country.

Imrana's story was presented in such a way as if a kind of first-in-history incident had taken place, as if such an event could take place only among Muslims, as if Islam only encourages such acts, as if Muslim women had no right to even raise a voice against this and as if this incident had come to light just by chance. The whole Muslim society was disturbed because of this nuisance created by the TV channels, but they did not care a whit about it nor did the government take any notice. Muslims were denigrated [defamed] at every place, on every channel. At one point of time, when Imrana realized that she was being made an excuse to openly attack Islam and Muslims, she refused to appear before the media. Yet the media and channel people tried every trick in the book to make them appear before the cameras and microphones. Her family-members were lured with money. There is also a report that a channel paid money to the local police to prevent the immediate arrest of the [allegedly] rapist father-in-law; he was to be arrested after he visited and then returned from the channel's studio. It is to be noted that by that time, Imrana had filed a case against her father-in-law in the police station.

There came many twists and turns in Imrana's story. At one point of time, it appeared that Imrana was lying and that the husband himself had fabricated the entire story to implicate the father-in-law owing to a property-related dispute. But the Hindi and English newspapers and TV channels did not let the truth appear before the public. The same cliché [over-repeated remark] was repeated hundreds of times: how oppressive Islam is for the woman that she becomes haraam [prohibited from continuing the marriage] for her husband after she is raped by her father-in-law. In other words, the media's objection was not on the [alleged] molestation of the woman by her father-in-law. Their only concern was about her becoming haraam for the current husband after being raped by her father-in-law.

A social evil is just an evil of the society. It has nothing to do with a faith or religion. But after the evil took place, the sharia's verdict in that case was a very big social evil for the biased media!

There are many aspects in the Rajkot incident that are to be noted. The said family is not illiterate, but well-educated. The husband himself is a doctor. Here the father-in-law did not violate the chastity of the woman in the darkness of night, but raped her after making her semi-unconscious, with the knowledge and consent of the husband, in accordance with a well-designed plan. The husband's family did not even show any shame or remorse after the event came to light. Rather they proudly acknowledged that this took place according to a preplanned scheme. Not only this, the father-in-law even tried to kill her when the woman tried to resist. On the other hand, the Muzaffarnagar family is not an educated one, but an illiterate one. There the father-in-law had allegedly done this in the darkness of night when the husband was not at home and he did not, in any way, support his father's act. In that case, it was simply an act provoked by the awakening of the Satan. But in this case, an impotent husband had allowed the modesty of her wife to be violated due to his longing for a child. Imagine what will happen of a society in which such children are born where the woman (mother) is wife to the son but the sperm in her body belongs to the father-in-law. This Rajkot incident is more grisly, shocking and shameful than the Imrana case of Muzaffarnagar. I am not making a case for bringing the hapless woman to face her beast-like father-in-law in the TV channel studios. I only want to stress that an evil is an evil which has nothing to do with any religion or faith. But the all-important question is that when the channels did not

consider the Rajkot incident reportable, why did they go over the top in reporting the Muzaffarnagar incident? What should we conclude from this discrepancy [difference in media coverage] except that the TV channels had spread the Muzaffarnagar news so much only on account of their hostility to Islam. And the Rajkot incident was not similarly covered because this would sully the Hindus. Are the channels and the national corporate media doing a great service to the nation by adopting this double standard?